Requestor Name:



Renaissance One Two North Central Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2391 602.229.5200 Fax 602,229,5890 www.quarles.com

Bob Atkins

Attorneys at Law in Milwaukee and Madison, Wisconsin Naples and Boca Raton, Florida Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona Chicago, Illinois

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 2 5 2006

Facsimile Transmission Form

Date: September 25, 2006 To: Fax No. Phone No. MS Appeal Brief-Patents Name **571-273-8300** Company/Firm Commissioner for Patents City, State Zip Country From: Robert D. Atkins 602.229.5690 602.229.5311 Re: USSN: 10/613,281 Confirmation No. 4021 Applicant: Brookshire, M. Message: IF YOU HAVE PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS FACSIMILE, PLEASE CALL US IMMEDIATELY AT: 602.229,5361 No. of Pages (Including Cover): Job Code: Client - Matter No.: 121236.00003 Time Keeper: RATKINS Return To: Recipient: MS Appeal Brief-Patents

IMPORTANT: THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED AND/OR CONFIDENTIAL. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA REGULAR POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

Phone No.:

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 2 5 2006

Under the Panersunk Reduction Act of 1995	DA DECENO	U.S. Peter	Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0661-00 d and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC on of information unless it displays a yalid OMB control numb
TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial thing)		Application Number	10/613,281
		Filing Date	July 3, 2003
		First Named Inventor	Michael D. Brookshire
		Art Unit	3677
		Examiner Name	Lavinder, Jack W.
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	6	Attorney Docket Number	121236.00003
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)			
Fee Transmittel Form	<u> </u>	Drawing(s)	After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC)
Fee Attached	H	Icensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC
Amendment/Reply		Pelition	(Appeal Notice, Brief, Raply Brief)
After Final	L P	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)		lower of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Addre	Status Letter
Extension of Time Request		erminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Express Abandonment Request	☐ R	Request for Refund	
Information Disclosure Statement		D, Number of CD(s)	
Gertified Copy of Priority	Remark	48	
Documentie)			
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application			
Response to Missing Parts			
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1,53			
SIGNAT	URE O	F APPLICANT, ATTORNE	Y, OR AGENT
	g. No. 3	4,288 - QUARLES & BRAI	DY STREICH LANG (LP
Signature Colonia D. Cttra			
Date September 25, 2006			
CE	RTIFIC	ATE OF TRANSMISSION	MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is bei	no facelmi	He transmitted to the USDTO or	eposited with the United States Postal Service with nts, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on
Typed or printed name Robert D. Atl	cina	0 4	
Signature	The) /the	Date Sept. 25, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The Information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiatity is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggest/one for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

2039699

р.3

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 2 5 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant(s) : Michael D. Brookshire

Serial Number 10/613,281 :

Date of Filing July 3, 2003

Title METHOD OF FACETING GEMSTONES TO :

PRODUCE SPIRALING EFFECT

Confirmation No. : 4021

Art Unit 3677 :

Examiner Lavinder, Jack W. :

USPTO Customer No. : 26707

Attorney Docket No. : 121236.00003

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant hereby submits this Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed July 25, 2006. Appellant wishes to maintain the present appeal.

II. STATUS OF CLAIMS

The present application contains 20 pending claims. Claims 25-44 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 25-44 have further been finally

QBPHX\2038623.1

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Diagrams for Faceting reference in view of Meyer (250378), Schenck (D35938), and Schenck (43724). A copy of claims 25-44, the claims on Appeal, is provided in the Appeal Brief.

II. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 25-44 are indefinite under U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Whether claims 25-44 are unpatentable under U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Diagrams for Faceting reference in view of Meyer (250378), Schenck (D35938), and Schenck (43724).

III. ARGUMENT

Appellant's Appeal Brief filed April 24, 2006, addresses the rejection of claims 25-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Diagrams for Faceting reference in view of Meyer (250378), Schenck (D35938), and Schenck (43724). Appellant believes the Examiner's Answer contains no new grounds for rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). No further discussion concerning the 103 rejection is deemed to be necessary or appropriate. However, Appellant believes the Examiner has presented new grounds for rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Appellant submits this Rely Brief to address the 112 rejection.

The Examiner rejects claims 25-44 based on the claim preamble which contains the language "naturally occurring precious gemstone." The Examiner believes that a precious gemstone cannot be naturally occurring.

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 25-44 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Appellant believes

that the Examiner is taking an unreasonable interpretation of the language "naturally occurring precious gemstone." The words "naturally", "occurring", and "precious" are adjectives to the noun "gemstone." Each of these adjectives describes or modifies the noun to more clearly state the subject matter of the present invention. The words "naturally" and "occurring" are intended to be read together to indicate the origin of the gemstone, prior to modification by human hands, i.e. from natural sources. In the specification, the naturally occurring gemstone is supported by a diamond, see page 2, line 4. No one would be confused to say that a diamond is a "naturally occurring gemstone." In that context, it is understood that the "naturally occurring" modifies "gemstone" to indicate its origin. Diamond rough is formed in the earth over eons of time. The diamond rough has value in its original state and many potential uses, including lasers, cutting tools, and jewelry. It is generally understood in the industry that diamonds become precious when modified by human hands (cut) to take on visually appealing characteristics. By cutting the diamond in a particular manner, light reflects through its internal structure and produces a highly desirable brilliance or scintillation. The diamond rough becomes a precious gemstone suitable for jewelry.

The Examiner rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is considered to be improper and an unreasonable interpretation of the claim language. The Examiner admitted choose not to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming non-statutory subject matter, i.e. naturally occurring things. The Examiner expressly states that:

> "[f]rom viewing the body of the claims, it is clear that the appellant is not trying to claim something that has naturally occurred in nature. The body of the claims discusses all the different cut facets in the stone, which could never naturally occur in nature."

Appellant believe that the Examiner's logic fails when he states that "a precious gemstone cannot naturally occur." This interpretation takes an unreasonably narrow and inconsistent view of the claim language. While it is true that one does not extract cut diamonds from the ground, it does not follow that the precious gemstone cannot have a naturally occurring origin. When read with the main body of the claim, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the preamble refers to the gemstone has having a naturally occurring origin, which is then modified to be have a precious state. It is the modification of the naturally occurring precious gemstone that is the subject matter of the present invention as recited in the main body of the claims.

Appellant has tried to be very precise and definite in the recitation of the present invention. The combination of the words "naturally occurring precious gemstone" provides a highly descriptive and definite recitation of the present invention. The gemstone has a naturally occurring origin (as oppose to artificial) and the gemstone is precious, i.e. modified by human hands from its naturally occurring state to become highly desirable. Accordingly, claims 25-44 are considered definite within the intent of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter.

٧. CONCLUSION

As a consequence, Appellant requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 25-44 in the instant patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP

September 25, 2006

Registration No. 34,288

Address all correspondence to:

Robert D. Atkins Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP One Renaissance Square Two North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004 Telephone: 602-229-5311

Facsimile: 602-229-5690 Email: rda@quarles.com